Table of Contents:

Pg. 1…9* The Nelsonicist Epistemology *

Pg. 9…28 *The Political and Ethical Discourses of Nelsonicism

Pg. 28… Glossary for The Discourse

Pg. 31… The FAQ on Nelsonicism

Key articles:

Article VII of Ethical Course

Article X of Ethical Course

The Pillars of Nelsonicism

The Introduction

The Discourses On

Nelsonicism

On the Existence of Conscience and rule of the Free Contract

Quantum physics may dictate that everything exists in a probability – which tells us that there is more than one reality if the existence of everything is random. And there're other theories and hypothesises, that is certain make ourselves question our sanity and reality. But one thing that can be deduced to, is that we *are* **sane.** If our consciences are unpredictable and unreal, then how should we ever even purposefully think? Our

thoughts would've, then no purpose, no direction – and I won't be writing this nor anyone would be reading this *and* understand if that's to be.

We had made out mathematics, science, and so on, which, as far as we know, are *real* and *objective*, thus, justifying the argument that consciousness does exist.

Now here, we have conscience, but I want you, the reader, to explore *who,* has conscience.

Living things.

A robot will not randomly wonder around a room upon his own will when he's first made, nor the a most advanced tank every made – if you instruct them so, of course they will. But if you put a cat or a human in that robot's place, they'll wonder around on their own will. Maybe they'll do some senseless things; maybe they'll fall from a chair. You can have a robot that is ten times more advanced than and brain of a cat neither will it do a thing without an order.

Only with conscience we can be aware of ourselves. Thus, we have the Ego. Ego is present in all living things.

Now, building the blocks for my philosophy, it begins with metaphysics. We don't know

absolutely sure what *is,* reality, but instead, from science, we know a number of things. There're the laws of physics that will never be broken. Gravity will always pull us toward the center of its mass. It does not pull backwards, and never will. Building from the fact does *consciousness* is there, we can deduct what we *conceive* into two categories: objective and subjective. What the consciousness senses, processes, and recognizes becomes *concepts.* The word, and the dimensions and the physical feel of an apple, can all be described as *concepts.* An apple may look red to one, but another person with a poorer eye may see it as pink – one man may say that that same apples tastes good, but another may dislike it, because he's tasted better apples – these, goes as *opinions,* or simply, ***subjective*** ;but the concept that the apple is of xxx species, friendly to how much PH of soil – these, are *facts, truths,* or simply, ***objective.***

Objective concepts come from science – whether we conceive them or not, find them or not, 2x + 2x will always be 4x. If your mother, a priest, or the President of the USA said it was 5x, the truth will still be actually 4x. We can prove that the equation is always 4x by giving x a number. And proceeding to prove it with a good handful of rocks. You

cannot *deny* an objective statement. You cannot deny *truth,* and the study of such truths manifest in various fields of science, and in mathematical and scientific logic as well – *empirical logic.*

But subjective things are, say, if you drink a soup – it will be spicy for a German and not a Turk. Because the Turk had eaten more spicy things than this, so this isn't very hot for him. But for the German, who is untrained to taste such a strong flavor, will have his tongue on fire. Like the case of the taste of the apple, they differ with the person experiencing or believing in them. As much as the Turk can deny that the soup is spicy, and it'll be right *for him.* Which brings us to the character, that: They *can* be denied, for they have not the proof of being universal or being a *Truth.* Religion is subjective. Many ethical systems are subjective. Morality is subjective nearly head to tail. See religion, for example – what it wants to do enforce a core idea of ethics and metaphysics for most of them; and what did they do? They made (or *declare)* themselves the truth – that they're ideas *are* science, and encompasses all, when they're actually mere opinions, and thus, religion, is a lie. For this lie the Taliban have sacrificed hundreds of thousands; for this lie, Iranians in 1979 ruined

themselves. For these lies a theist will have surely spent countless hours of his precious life, working towards an unseen heaven. Another thing, *we cannot know what we cannot see or measure.* By ‘see', it means either the five senses or measurement. Hallucinations don't count, why? A hallucination has been, by all measures of science, *false* signals from our body and our consciousness that manifests in near-real experience.

That also brings us to the matter of right or wrong, or rather, *true* or *false*. Is the hallucination real? No! It is our body and our brain (consciousness) sending out *false* signals to our brain because drugs, brain damage, but, say, the hallucination shows a ghost in a room – is there a ghost in the room? No. It isn't there *actually*, and it is objective that, by physical actuality, it is not there! A similar thing occurs when we see a very thick soup not moving, in place, and a spoon just laying on top – from a distance it seems to be a solid. Say our two friends from before, say that “It's a solid.” But it is not; it is *objectively* a liquid, the spoon is *floating* and slowly sinking as opposed to actually laying *on* it. If we test the soup to convince the Turk and the German, it will be fact that the soup will take the shape of its container,

boil, and also freeze – while a solid will never do this. We *know* because we can *see* – and *measure.*

But can we know that the Ego exist? It *is* a fact. Even if you take it grammatically. Simply it is: me, for me – is ego;John for John is the ego. It is me! It is our*selves.* We can see it so vividly that it will be confusing to prove any further. Abstract yes, but deniable? No! It is simply the word, ‘self’ and and the conscious awareness of it. We, as intelligent humans, operate from what we *know,* rather than what we *want.* If we want God, if we think there is a God – then let it stay subjective, and it is unworkable to make such a thing without proof an actual fact. If a god is subjective, then he dies literally if we stop believing in him. An opinion ceases to exist after you've stopped having the opinion. An unproved theory goes the same. They do not exist on their *own* – they need the support of a *believer*, and are very importantly, *deniable*.

And, how did we get to worshipping such gods as if they're real, then?

But our brains process far more power than to simply sense our environment. So we develop clericalism (the want and the act serving a higher being, imaginary or real), and morals (there's a difference between morals and ethics). To

distinguish the basic question of good and bad at first. Which is already a blunder. This grows to the benefit of various ‘Higher' beings. The State exploited religion extensively until the 19th ce; the Catholic church held such a disgusting deal of power before the Protestant movements; and of course, now we see politicians calling for votes in the name of democracy and national interest ruining both of their *clerics* (the subject of *clericalism* – claimed or real). Those men are far more powerful than who *clericalises* (the action of *clericalism*) them. The king with divine right could’ve killed you – and it'd just be ‘God's will’, and to speak against him would be to speak against God and thus you're now a heretic. You never signed an agreement with him or God! You don't even know if God even exists. And you never agreed for that King to tax your coin, your harvest, or even accept him!

And aren't the *clerics* higher than you? They manifest in God, in priests, in the politicians, in fascism and ultra-nationalism. They'll make you, even force you, to serve *them,* a *higher* person – but you shan't! You are egoist. You know that the egos is higher than all because YOU are the Egos. And thus is born a free man – his pursuits are for

himself, to none else like Nature had given us all to do so; he does not waste money on an unseen god, an unseen nirvana; he does not follow the wordings of the collective nor the loud; he follows himself – he *is* ***truly****, his own,* so that the poor can work for themselves, pull themselves out of hell, and the rich unburdened of their own prosperity; so that, the rising can rise without hindrance, so that the failing can save themselves, and the world shall not choke me, and it shall neither choke anyone!

(The main reading should begin at Ethical discourse which is misplaced as after the Political discourse. If you're confused about where Nelsonicism is heading – it is an anarchist or extreme minarchist, with libertarian and materialist elements, and of course, Egoist to an extreme, and rationalist and liberal, if you want to include every single dot. I’m not anarcho-capitalist, nor is this socialist or mutualist as it is Egoist in the first place. Anarcho-capitalism would be viewed materialistically as warlordism, besides the fact that the current corporates and companies run or cooperate with the State we wish to overthrow . By materialist, I intend to indicate that we take what's *actually* happening as

opposed to adhere to theory. For example, communism could've resulted in a completely property-less, stateless society, have the horrible flaw of giving too much power to the State in its ‘socialist’ stage. And thus, the human fallacy combines that flaw to result in the dystopian hellscapes of North Korea and the Gulags – the point is, ultimately, this material events are more important than the theory.)

Rule of the Free Contract:

By agreeing to a contract, or simply stating something that is to be adhered to achieved, we had set a standard that is, because it has been written and agreed, objective and factual. Breaching this contract would be a universal crime, as you have LIED (=said a false thing), and renders our own words unreliable; and thus we have a thousand knives drawn against a breacher of contract for he has proved himself a liar. He does not fail any morality, but he fails himself and an objective standard. Thus, we can say that the Golden Pillar of Nelsonicism, for the ease of the reader, will be based upon:

The Foremost Pillar: The Free Contract, ABOVE ALL; the True, ABOVE ALL!

Political Course

I.

<u>The First Pillar: the State...</u>

In the most practical sense, the State trades some of your freedom and wealth to give you services in return, sometimes you're involuntary in this contract. The State is not economically productive at all by itself. The State, ***RULES****! One thing it needs to* ***RULE****, it to be* ***tolerated*** *by its people, or does it?*

Power of the State, exists by having the advantages of destruction and authority over Persons and Society, from stripping them of independence, by providing the Society and the Persons with services, and taking a share of resources in many forms from it. It wants a monopoly on violence, on the decisions of justice – a monopoly on crime, and a monopoly to lie, that all else that do so are criminals.(a monopoly is a right or a status in which only one person can do something and everyone cannot) But a good state does not want those – it fulfills its duty to its subjects (i.e., duty is created by the nominal contract that occurs between a ruler and its subjects. Contracts and declarations create duty, not morality) A democratic State has a formal contract (ie, the terms it must do are stated it its contract – which are constitutions, laws, and so on); a State claiming other sources of legitimacy have an informal contract, that is, mostly a social matter than a rule of law like a formal contract.

Pillar of Ruling:

But a State cannot by any means be perfect in interfering with a society. A

society is a thing so complex, interference in it is just like the creation of a nuclear bomb without understanding the nature of uranium and atoms.

THE GOOD STATE will try to adhere to its contract with society, so that both parties improve; but the egoism that nature gave us will result in a prioritization of itself over its subjects. But it will still be humane and honor its contract. We can see a good State in South Korea – formerly authoritarian, heavy taxes, yes; but the South Korean can have one of the best social services systems on Earth. A more ideal example can be seen in the early 20th ce USA – it has a relatively loose hands on the economy, and maintains that citizens be armed, as well as a good public services and infrastructure, though not perfect at all.

A bad one will only work for itself, and will absolutely use its current monopoly on force to commit coercion and murder on a mass scale. Say, when did you agree with the government to ever accept its taxation, or even accept its rule of law?

As you would have never agreed with a robber taking your money – we would preferably revolt against this coercion. But a State takes on the cloak of law, and even democracy to justify its crimes. So that when you don't agree to pay taxes, you are then violating the law set by democratically elected politicians and violating a social ‘contract’ that had never been a contract. Worse, a bad State have no respect for the future of its subjects.

The example of **THE BAD STATE** can be seen in absolutist France, especially in its later years. Where we see taxation after taxation after taxation that did no good to its subjects. Obviously to increase revenue for the State’s affairs rather than for its miserable subjects. A full reference to what was occurring would be too long and too complex – basically the feudal system of the ancien regime went corrupt, and many very unbeneficial measures were taken. France's feudal system was quick to fill their pockets here – and thus, they broke their contract both to the king and to its subjects. This was done by a king who had no actual

democratic legitimacy; even if say, the king is now a president doing the same thing, then, when did anyone ever agreed to be taxed? They could abandon all State services and regulations and taxations and live a far better life than being enslaved by the useless State.

The grand resources the State forms things that makes it partially independent of the Persons and the Society's will to keep it; namely: an Army, a Policing Force, Laws that protect itself from legitimate rebellion both on paper and materialistically, (materialistically = not taking the word on paper or theory, and focusing only what happens on ground – what actually happens physically) and Restricts the power of Persons and Society and proclaiming Legitimacy that, therefore by some Reason, that they should and must rule.

That Reason, unless absolutely proven by Scientific (factual, measurable; see a fair election) means, is invalid and anyone is therefore free to overthrow them(but not rule). For example, Hitler declaring that Germans are superior to all races and nationals else is *incorrect,* because it is not

so and cannot be measured back then and now. And, if he declared that God gave him and the Nazi party the right to rule, then I must ask for evidence and what papers God gave him. And here, we must understand that we only know what we can see (sense by our five senses), and measure, and by logic. And one of the basest rules of theory, is ignoring what's completely unknown – or in other words, keeping it out of the equation.

The example of a powerful State being good can be seen in South Korea and China; the example for a bad one can be seen in Ba'athist Syria and the Soviet Union. In South Korea, the heavy taxation and a heavily centralized State structure is mostly paid off the excellent State services. But this justifies not of its quasi-fascistic oppression before its democratization; nor Deng Xiaoping's economical reforms justify any shots fired upon the students of 1989 in Tiananmen Square.
Society and the State to the biggest extent exists because the biological need of humans, not by any other logic. And humans,

if not needing each other are not naturally and logically bound.

Remember, society is only there because of need – if you don't, and feels like leaving it, do it so. If you do, stay. Contribution is to be done only voluntarily.

The main point here is that we scarcely are obliged by any other means than the biological and economic needs of humans to live and act as a community or obey any State or authority. Because it has a net benefit to the individual – either measured by economic stability, happiness, or security of his basic needs. But a net un-benefit will completely justify leaving or isolating oneself from the community. But, (for the sake of clarification), does not justify a genocide on that community.

The State is built upon a foundation, a building, a stack-by-stack, that is collapsed with one brick out. The bricks constructed by the flesh from society, flesh of its subjects!

Except that some of the bricks weights more than society itself.

II. Because the Society and its Persons are dependent on and gullible to the State. We

could say that every Dependence is a Weakness that gives the one being dependent on, or having someone at their mercy, an Advantage. But he may have other Weaknesses, that, things may cancel out each other in a Fight, or in Clausewitzian principles, a War. And those Advantages may relate with each other to form more complex conditions. The State should control the greatest Destructive Power in a Society (and not a monopoly on it, for example, it should have the only combined arms army across an army, air force, navy and an infiltration force; other armed forces cannot have this feature), and it must not hold a monopoly on force, (as much as a policeman can shoot a thief, anyone else should also be able to do so without trouble, for the State had failed to protect him and thus he must do it himself. If the State arrests him, then I dare say the State had committed a breach of contract and somewhere along the lines of a coercion), Authority, and Legitimacy – here, is a normal State. A bad one will have just Destructive Power and Authority stemming from it, and of course, most importantly, must materialistically perform poorly.

For example, a fascist state may be illegitimate, but if it performs well, it is then a ‘good’ state; if a tribal democracy is legitimate but performs poorly, then it is a bad state.
But the fascist state will not be legitimate, will be oppressive, and its economic and scientific success justifies none of its atrocious acts; and neither is the tribal democracy's democratic system made illegitimate because of its own imcompetence in other fields.
Of a good one, we can say that it materialistically performs well; loved by the people; grants the most freedom; who is the least corrupt; who gets the most money for itself – and more, because goodness and badness goes with opinion that, is not solid facts. One of the other features of a good State is when its eats up resources,because it must, as the State grants itself a huge value of power, give its tax payers back what they expects, and waste none – in fact, in this model, taxation must be an agreed upon

thing with a contract from both sides. You shan't receive what you did not pay for.

Second Pillar: Understanding of: *Power*

III.

We have these kinds of Power:

…**Possessive** Power (the quality of having something that maybe turned into other powers – *the base of all powers;* sometimes powerful in possession alone, but very fallible); **example:** the KGB agent Mikhail with State secrets, and a lot of money – both carry possessive powers

…**Destructive** (made up or equal to Strength. Superior force or strength is infallible); **example:** the Soviet Red Army gets a new tank from the KGB agent Mikhail's stolen secrets, and use it shoot a Polish protester

…**Legitimate** (made up by Truth, and Reason, infallible); **example:** Boris Yeltsin wins the election free and fair – a democratically elected leader is legitimate. He draws up a mathematical calculation of Russia's GDP: 1.5 $ trillion. It is done with a computer, and even if he, the Patriarch, or his wife says that it is anything else than 1.5 trillion $, it will still remain the same, true number; but if he uses it in an argument, he will have the backing of science and the truth to him.

…**Authorative** (either made up by Legitimacy, Popularity or Strength. Fallible); **example:** KGB agent Mikhail retires and becomes a civil servant and a father: as a civil servant, he has the backing of the State, *and* the ability to scold you as to reinforce his authority; as a father he is naturally loved, feared, and he regularly rewards his children generously – reinforcing his authority; by being a bad father, he cannot wish to wield power as much being a legitimate and a good one.

…**Popularity** (made up by Society; fallible); **example**: former KGB agent Mikhail runs for town mayor, and, because he is a good civil servant, people like him, and vote for him; a man protects an assassination attempt for his favorite mayor.

And combinations or mutation may result in new ones, but ultimately, it is these ***5 bases of power*** that manifests from and in all.

Of these, only the second and third may be considered infallible. None cannot deny the power of a rifle and its bullets unless you have body armor and another rifle with bullets to deny it. Legitimacy is Scientific fact, Materialistic fact, and Truth – these are not deniable or subjective at all. If a State writes a constitution that it claims power and representation from the people, then it has written facts for it follow – articles that are objective, it must do so, or it is illegimate – because it *must* match its written claim. But if a State writes a constitution that claims legitimacy from a certain class of peoples but does deeds that reflect and represent all people under it – and if our criteria is universal representation, then it *is* legitimate. Material exceeds theory.

V. Now we will get to Legitimacy of a State, that is, in a Democracy for example, comes from the people and therefore must represent the Persons who throned the State or at least the Society.

Now there is the **IRON LAW OF OLIGARCHY**.

(Oligarchy is a person or a government in which a few elite persons rule, mostly undemocratically. The Iron Law of Oligarchy states that all forms of the State are oligarchies more or less)

Democracy oftenly; and by modern cases – always, collapses into a bloated Oligarchy built on lies and Capitalism and profiteering. Because it will never and is impossible to be a shared responsibility – because all men have a certain ego that must be obliged, and applying so to politicians and voters with indifference. Persons upon which it builds have no solid power to stop the Oligarchs. This discussion brings us to another pillar.

Third Pillar: ***The Legitimate? Or not?***

The Iron Law of Oligarchy *governs that any form of government floats into some sort od oligarchy a way or another. To limit this, we are to arm the citizen and decentralized institutions*

from schools to arms factories to armies mirrors the States'. We shall always ***talk,*** *even when the force of the rifle is present, but we* ***talk with our own rifles*** *– and open to conversation we are, still.* ***All agreements mean nothing without enforcement.***

The electors, the people, hold one of the Two Infallible Powers, so why oligarchy happens all the time why? The oligarchy roots from monopoly on the other infallible: destructive power. people of China have the intelligence and sense that they're enslaved (with much benefit to the Chinese people anyway) under the boot of the CCP – and they feel well that their rights and freedom that birthed with them gave them are being robbed, yet all of it ends upon a barrel of a gun, and the bang of a judge's hammer, because they simply possess absolutely no power to even challenge their captors except in their conscience – but if we look at the other side of the world upon the armed American population, they have little interest, and less urge to overthrow their own bloated oligarchy. Both urge and arms are needed to overthrow an oppressor – and intelligence as well. Only with all those can a society and its persons can be in control of the State. If not ridden well like a very

fast chariot, one is bound to die from a lost of control, even a slight one. But in a race, such risks are necessary if victory is desired. By the ‘race', I mean the race of States, the race of nations.

VI. Doesn't Legitimate Power gives Justification, Authority and Popularity for the Destructive Power, who, nonetheless, is always vulnerable without other Powers?

They have no Destructive Power.

Then how shall we give them?

Firstly, we can make them Intelligent – that is, in Education. The amount of power a good brain holds is incalculably terrifying – that screams ‘Death' to a tyranny... An Education that is available to all and perfectly neutral and UNCONTROLLED by any man. This comes easy-sounding and hard as well, for the press and media are under the Oligarchs. But possible if the Society is willing as for now, at least. But we must remember that Society can be a herd of sheep, thereof cooperative to the State, and only some other Force or the State may give them tusks, drive them to a grassy field, etc. Surely you may see fierce Societies, but nonetheless sheep in crocodile hide and boars’ tusks. The ferocity

amongst society are very usually from a few Persons who may form a ferocious people amongst a Society.

And then, give those Intellects Destructive Power, in a passive way. Having armaments, say, to be Reasonable, only small arms (rifles, pistols, automatic carbines, shot guns, etc; heavy arms are machine guns,tanks, fighter jets, missiles and rockets, etc) for every adult is, then yes, by certain standards passive, not enough to cause general chaos and build an Anarchy. But if we consider simple arms, so easily defeated by the grandeur ones of the Stately Armies, then we must limit the State itself in its Constitution and formation to not to be able to enforce its policies upon an involuntary People and Society.

But today's intellect are bound by human virtues, that though instrumental in the functioning all social aspects, ultimately not a law of nature. They're instructed in their education, from the barking of their mothers to the great lectures of the university, a certain scope of human values that are, taken as unbreakable rules of life – just how the State wants its subjects to be: fools. Others are driven by fear, by mass coercion that should be responded with a machine gun, but also,

in summary, a steady nailing-in. They think for themselves – but only inside a box. A box that they've jumped into and can jump back anytime. After this paragraphs and those before, we now have made out another pillar.

But being materialistic, it must be said that Masses aren't the best political machine – and easily a horrible one, and loud-mouths that are politicians and senators goes nearly the same. Because everyone agreed to a thing does not mean that a thing is right or beneficial – in fact, they often goes fool-hardy. So let Political matters that does not effect the Persons or Society proceed with a body of experts, geniuses and statesmen where they will play their Stately games. But any decision that massively and directly involves the Persons of the Society, or requires Society to co-operate, must be firmly decided by the very souls who should run the act if decided. And this shall be done free of intoxication of any Parties – be it Ideologies, the State or Popular Persons, or anything.

VII. But the raise of tariffs by 0.5%, a simple construction of a new bridge with drafted labor shall not be in the hands of obviously unwilling tax-

> payers and lazy laborers. But should there involve a drop of blood from Persons, a limit to Our Individual Powers and an extension of the State's, or the poverty and suffering of many of Society, and such and such matters of importance, that threatens the People’s Lives, Power, Freedom, Rights, Liberty and other many important things that will be in such a long, quite an egalitarian list that it should fill a whole library.

State archives on personal data, any data that allows the State to track down a person pin-point, must be abolished.

There must be no Intelligence Ministry that may spy on the population. It does not concern us that the State may spy on foreign nations or their peoples.

Any organized civil policing system that is on paper and materialistically owned by the State must be abolished – and replaced by volunteers or private companies who must have no allegiance to any Forces that wish or is in their interests and capabilities to oppress the Persons and Society’s freedom. A KGB on your tail is more dangerous

than a thief. You may shoot a thief. But if you shoot the KGB agent, it's more likely that he's shot and wounded you first; you'll then guarantee yourself a death sentence, literally.

In foreign policy, unless under this system or if such a grandly liberal one like Athens (which didn't and will not go well) it should be noted that the population and the country are not represented by the State to other States, Persons, and countries.

There must be completely no moral, or stately censorship. Since either are useful to save the State and Oligarchs from critique.

In short, the State must be stripped of all Powers that allows it restrict us with force except its exceptional funding (taxation, only for instances when we need the State's services or where it must spend its resources),a powerful internal structure within' the institution itself, and the Army needed for Stately Games.

VIII. The State should not have a strong grip on the free market, except for those that involves the lives and other grave matters of its citizens. It is a ‘free'

> market. And a market of productive persons whom the State's anti-productive hands should not choke. It should see to, with its power, order and prevent other and more harmful parasites than its useful parasitic nature on the market. Just like the bacteria in our guts – it eats up a little of our food and keep the physique stable and safe; the State should be like those creatures – not ringworms. Unfortunately, the current democratic, socialist, and fascistic States are more like ringworms than *lacto bacillus*.

The State should not own, or distribute any media – it is the acting force of a society, not a vocal cord.

In short, the State must be stripped of all powers internal that is and can be used to oppress its subjects; or prevent its subjects from overthrowing it.

But there must be enough authority not to create a vacuum, and to keep harmful tendencies of men at bay that manifests as warlordism (the use of force to rule), banditry (robbing on a larger, more violent scale) and mass exploitation (of workers,

of people; unfair use and paying of labor and other contracts that are probably not legitimate or free) – these the State must not do it itself. And most States are currently doing all three of these on a gigantic scale.

A State must be weak internally and strong externally.

Since the only infallible Power is Destructive, we must give settlers, anarchists, liberatarians, etc, people whose ideologies and activities contradict the existence of the State, the Destructive Power of Arms. Such is the only means by which true freedom of expression and ideology. For otherwise they would be under the State's mercy, whose powers are nevertheless, strong, even under our many weakenings.

But these systems are built upon things that are collapsable.Then how about Anarchy? Even a conservative one? But Men, being exploitive by his nature, and must be, without the great governing body that is the State, won't more tyrannous, horrifying things that we call ‘banditry’ very commonly, take over the vacuum? These warlords will rely sheerly on Destructive Power, and they owe nothing to none unlike the State, but to their own skin.

IX. And let us not forget that the State is just another organization, humane, just like any persons. But, see, it holds a *special* place in civilization as being contracted to organize, use, and improve society and its resources – it has a deal with *society*. But because it is humane as we know till now, it will enact in its interests too. They may let the persons and society have *some* power over it as in a democracy – but alas, a revolution must come if to actually free ourselves in a minarchy! And thus we are to treat it humanely with flesh and souls, plainly, tricking it like a human.

Here, we can see some of the wastages of state welfare systems. Those created by Society usually are not very burdensome, and crowd-funded by nature. Sometimes, on the contrary, the State's welfare systems sometimes return nothing to the State at all. Of course, education, sports, medical sector, etc, gives back some profit to the State and the persons, but other things are worse, like the Libertarians put it, it takes away from the productive to be wasted on the unproductive. Some of such problems *must* be ignored – they cost too much to solve, and even when solved, returns nothing. Yes, not the best solution, but

better than wastage. But such important services should not be ran by private peoples – especially health care and where it concerns our lives, here, the power of the State must save its subjects, from the possibly worse tyrannies of capitalism.

Of capitalism, we must develop a taxation system for this minarchist State. Just like how one goes to a school, pays the fee, and gets its services, the State should tax you only for what you actually use, and therefore, it should be optional. One can refuse to sign up for state education, social security, and even his running water if he wishes so. He can refuse to pay any taxes or fees for trains, and not ride in them; but he cannot refuse to pay the fee on the train and expect to ride on it. The state will simply be an armed service provider. And since the private school, nor the private bus obliges an excess of service from the customer, there must be no mandatory taxation, nor other requirements such as labor, for example (see the Inca Empire, or 1780’s France), or conscription. We have no obligation to defend another person if we don't want to - there's no contract whatsoever to do so. Wars, are between States, not peoples; no whole peoples have had and, probably will never have any reason to mass slaughter each other in

the millions for the want of a few islands. We only have to look at nearly all the wars fought, to see that none of the conscripted dying there have obligation nor sincere will to kill the other, or die – and we may ask, has it benefitted who, the greatest? The State. Surely, the many Soviet conscripts and British conscripts during the World Wars have secured a brighter future for their respective peoples after their sacrifices, but it has never been their *will to* sacrifice. And the greatest beneficial so far, has been their States. Not nations, - *States.* Say the Germans had won. Then the Soviet and British states fail and their peoples suffer horridly under the fascist system. Those people, yes, do suffer, but the greatest loser have been the States – they had been wiped out.

X. An anarchy is attractive – it is sensible to remove every taxation (already done – at least the unconsented ones), every governing oppression that goes to unbenifftable causes, and simply barter our trade, police our own towns, arm ourselves. A new bridge wanted? Go build one yourself; hire more men if you will it. Want to kill someone? Do that at the risk of reprisal. Want education? Go up to the internet and do so at will. But great things does not last too long – because,

when nothing is there to keep the State away, they will rise again worse as Warlords. If companies and cooperates are to rule, then they would be warlords built upon money. All these two are in effect, uncontracted States.

And, when the rich, when the armed, when the warlords may rule us – they may not be the State, they may not claim tyranny, but their tyranny, which's allegiance owes nothing but to their flesh, unlike a State whose power may rest on you, on society, however tyrannous, will be much more terrible. Any entity similar to a state or ruling, *is* a State. A company ruling a village is its State, *practically.*

Fourth Pillar: *The Bricks of the Free Nation*

*By **contract** shall be the rule of justice and persecution, taxation, bills, laws, infrastructure , services,*

***Abolished** shall be the police, the records of spying, the beauro of internal terror, and efficient, shall be the Stately projects*

***Strengthened:** be the rule contract, the freedom of our thought, the freedom of our very own justice, the freedom of the people's and the individual's counter-terroism*

Or we could make the State entirely mechanic – it is a system whose purpose is to work as a machine. But Science have yet to grant us such a splendid beaurocrats. Of human beaurocrats, they must have some Legitimacy in their position for us to oblige them. But such a process of democracy must not hinder the performance of a beaurocracy whose function is to be a machine.

XI. And we are unwanted of such a barbaric way of civilization, but we loathe that we have to stand in lines, be checked into our own car for the sake of other men who we do not care about, be forbidden to possess arms because of a State's empty notions of security when itself *is* the danger. A civilization with no central authority that is the State is weak and prone to conquest and collapse. But we take away everything the State's grand side-effects and leave it only as a clean tool. By minarchist, I really mean it. The State is little more than an armed service provider.

We may modify the State so that it is truly ours and only administered by Oligarchs; we may remove passports, biometrics and its monopolies, but the State is to stay – leashed and lassoed like a

buffaloe, and it frankly, for sake of Our Human Species, MUST.

Ethical System

I.

First Pillar: The Selfish is the True; Self, the End to a Means

Aristotelians say that our forms partially determine what we *should* do – which is **ethics**, by our forms. With his logic, and combining it with ours, living things has an egos because they're aware of it, and can actually serve it – and thus he should serve the Egos. Being suicidal, for example, will be wrong for us, because it is harming the Ego. But being sucidal because all hope is lost can be valid – because it is simply to end the suffering of the Ego. (having a consciousness gives us an awareness of ourselves; having a consciousness, which is to be alive, by over-simplification.).

And every consciousness is given a ‘unique’ as to Max Stirner. That *Unique* – is the ***Egos***. And we will serve it – as we're supposed to. The Egos is

the “I”, and for John, it shall be “John”; John himself will serve himself – *HE* is the ***Egos*** to him as ***I*** am to me. But foolish of us to throw that Egos behind a cloud and follow the sweet notions of morality into no particular benefit but to be liked by such clericalists. More or less meterial benefit occurs (eg, rewarded for good behavior in a school).

But in doing so, Stirner will call such a an action clericalist.

And thus, shame and honor will be the bane of the Ego; contradictory to one's given form. It limits our steps, and retards your thought in boundaries that are, frankly – never existent.

But say we set a contract, or a declaration, then, by this honest (and positive statement), we have set standard for us to adhere or try to, at least. It is a statement that can be made true, unlike religion, which will is unknown and unknown quite forever unless someone discovered a parallel universe. Adhering to these, formal or informal, I call, in a new sense, *Honor*, it is absolutely different yet similar to the traditional sense of honor. We can both call the Black Baron (of the Russian Civil War) an honorable person – he adhered to his informal contract of being humane

and traditional as opposed to the Bolsheviks' inhumane and unkind ideological fanaticism and extreme radicalism, but he never signed a formal contract – yet he fought, Always with Honor, all the way to 1924.

Ethics does not exist in an undeniable way. We can follow a lot of valid ones that does not contradict science, or our ego. Only science exists in an undeniable and it is the greatest stupidity to deny science. Any creature owes nothing to anyone but to himself, for it is HIM, and it is the EGO, and only his interests are valid to him and it is not his to take others interests into account unless it may harm or contribute to his. Any ethics that goes against Science and Fact is invalid and therefore, Scientifically, wrong. For example, if a certain religion declares the Earth to be flat when it is round, then that religion is false. But if a religion says people should not kill without sufficient reason, and accepts its own subjective nature, then it is valid, and also, its ideals actually practical. Following the Precepts of Buddha seems rather impractical, and if it's harmful, take it off. It's a mere subjective because it is deniable.

But if someone declares something subjective, then, because he had claimed that he had said so,

like the constitution of a State, then it is his given duty to act accordingly – that is, a formal contract in the form of a *decleration*. This is different from a Statement – which simply shows a concept (‘a tree is 5m tall, and it's long'; the first part is objective and the second is a subjective *concept).* Anything else that does not do so is valid, but if it requires sacrifice for something that does not concern a person’s interest, or, more importantly, *coerces* him to do so, then to this thought it is invalid. But if it is your wish to follow such ethics and religion, then I allow willing skins be sold on the market. Feudalism – with this logic, would be illegitimate. It is a form of extreme beaurocracy that essentially give greater freedoms and entitlement to a few, whilst everyone should have them, or should not be granted at all. They hold no consent, and no facts – and even enforced by nothing in some modern cases of social hiearchy.

Worse, *many* (not all are so, and not all are bad) of a Society's rules of conducts and regulations are mostly there to make bowing down to the Strongest sweeter(I shall prove it: a parent and a child – who is at the mercy of whom? A teacher and a student – who has the greater authority? A lord and his vassal; the elder or the younger?), but

have grown too much as a cause of the human mind's tendency to overthink some matters, that it involves bowing down to things unproven, unseen, and false, and also materialistically hindering to progression of Science that may or may not be beneficial to persons, but is an utmost necessity for a civilization and deadly when States race one another (the loser may or may not get wiped off the Earth – with of course, its lands, culture and people for some fool’s idea merged a country with the State)

And you may ask, such hierarchies are simply a natural occurrence for many, except for some – so why bother a revolution against them? They are not a NECESSARY phenomenon like the respiration of the cells; we can avoid them, and, haven't we been known to shave off naturally occurring hair for our convenience? Haven't we felled naturally-occurring trees to our convenience? Won't that hair you shave be inconvenient for a chef, and may fall into an unfortunate beef stew? Won't that tree outgrow and give an unwanted shade to a garden? You may even use its demise directly by harvesting the wood for wonderful oak fence. Such is the purpose of the Nelsonicist thought – it can and will

overthrow a natural phenomenon, only if the Egos shall follow.

II.1

Second Pillar: Efficient over the Moral

Here I will explain why our ideology is against certain kinds of State welfare services. Happiness is the greatest virtue of human life, no matter what the Buddhists or Hindus says. And thus it should guide the Egos – happiness : both for you and others, if wanted. Why? We know what we see; and since *happiness* is the most pleasurable of emotions known to men, and working on what we have, we then have it as a Golden Virtue for consciousness.

We do not know of other heavens for happiness than the happiness to obtain here on Earth. But to be happy, we need material and conditions to do so – in effect, we have to work, we have to be *productive,* from the hunters of the stone age Siberia to the Emperor of Rome, they are required to be productive – they have to *work.* The hunter will starve to death if not; and the Emperor will be overthrown if not. But a criminal will steal, will

extort rather than obliging to fair trade – that, is the modern state on the worst level (yes, they’re just robbers – just look at North Korea). A bad state lives off such extortion. But a good one takes in those resources, and turns them into the benefit of its citizens that they expect – it does not take too little, or too much. For an unproductive someone must provide for their wants and biological needs. And humans are limited in time, resources finite, and his strength and qualities are never infinite. Time maybe the most important – which makes the pursuit of our happiness as ever urgent, and without waste, executed with effort. The State is just like a human, a mortal thing. It may invest in something to be returned. If your welfare services returns a net negative to the State – and then, don't! No elderly homes, no welfare services for beggars! Sure, they do deserve to be saved, but wasting too much for a return of nothing! The State does have a contract for sure, but it still has its Egos.

But for the return of reputation, we should not invest gold – reputation exists in the mind, and gold buys you rifles to blast that brain. But if it stands unburdensome, than we should commence some charity to buy Reputation.

Of the productive services, education will turn out more successful businessmen, better public servants, and so on, but if it turns out better anti-statists, then why invest in it at all if your State is looking for its own protection? But to prevent such from happening, many States implement propaganda that is, morals and the idea of law-abiding in their education. See how they fervently install individual confidence and not Egoism. See how they fervently shout into children about the environment and social equality and not more striking problems as how ruinous themselves are to those children. Indeed, such education has merely produced capable subservience – but Nelsonicist education will and must turn out free men. The egos must be free from all.

Or spread such poison by other means, even discreet ones. And society willingly cooperates! Such pestilence of cowardice! Worst, they don't think outside those non-existent boundaries – the result? Those who can think outside the box very happily enslaves them. We only have to look at the realpolitik nature of global politics to see through their farce. See this example:

II.2. ‘The poor ma serves God, his family, patriotic, and not his own needy self – the corrupt

local priest gets rich, and buys his way to be a bishop. But an honest priest do better, and criticize the bishop's practices – he is jailed. Say that their nation goes to war. Now cries of nationalism sores and the clergy begin claiming divine right to wage war. The State conscripts the poor man – he is trained, armed, and sent to the front where he fights bravely, as his family starves back home. At a battle, he volunteers to blow up a bridge in patriotic fervor. He manages to mine the bridge, but as he courageously escapes back to his trench, he is shot in the leg, and made a cripple. Meanwhile the corrupt bishop eats off the war funds and line his purses. The poor man, after the war, comes back home and organizes protests with other vaterans, that since he'd fought for State, and since he’s been promised so, he should receive a pension. Does he get it? No, he is shot by the police. But his friends begin to rebel against the State by an insurgency. They manage to overthrow the current State, and thus dealing justice.

What we just saw here, was the corrupt priest dishonestly (and by breaking contracts), getting rich, and verbal protests outdone by bullets. But when those bullets are protested with other

bullets, then your protest will be heard. The poor man has died, for what Stirner called a ‘spook'. He'd have simply stayed back when the bridge was to be blown up; he'd have dodged the draft, and he'd have been a thief for his desperate poverty, even. Of course, stealing a fair-earned wealth is still totally unethical in all ethical systems known to men, probably.

III.

But now, why should the State invest in a beggar's welfare service, if it returns nothing? Obviously only a democracy can do so at the hands of senators and politicians – for more votes, of course. But they disregard that resources are finite as much as time, and they had wasted them. Even if such a welfare service succeeds, it will return nothing; and there's a broad chance that it won't. See, those beggars may've been cheated, lied on, extorted (lying, cheating, robbing are the most common means of funding the current model of the State, democratic or autocratic, does with grand perfection if it's a bad one), without his hand in it. He does deserve to be saved. But why

invest in him without profit if another does? If he does, of course invest into his salvation, but materialistically, little and less is there to be offered. But always remember before a blunder, that absolute efficiency > morality. And morality is an abstract concept that isn't even defined, whose beneficiary is not you – it's society! But who loves to use it the most? The STATE!

But now, it brings us to the question of charity. It wastes your money, bluntly put, but it gives you happiness, maybe a cleaner soul. A charity at the point of a rifle or the voices of a herd of sheepish humans is no charity – even if you had done it yourself; it stands as an accidental theft on the receiver, and a robbery on the enforcers.

IV.

Aid is help, or sending material without commencing a direct action oneself, and without harming or at the expense of another person. The Lend-lease would then be an intervention – done at the direct harm and expense of the Germans. If one wishes to get a communist utopia, then where is utopia if no one wants to be in that so-called utopia?

V.

Of what's one’s responsibility, it is connected entirely with their will and cause-&-effect. If your mother wills you wash your clothes, but you do not, then it is hers to wash them, because she wills it, not you (and you cope yourself with dirty clothes, if she does not); forcing you to do her will would be Illegitimate. I recommend doing things out of our wills, simply because of benefit, but only if we see a benefit – if there's not, then it'd be against our principle. Now, about the cause-&-effect nature of responsibility – if someone caused a problem, say, as a side-effect of an another action which is by his will, then the responsibility goes to that person, simply because he had *caused* it. Upon a declaration of responsibility, then the declarant is supposed to be accordingly with his declaration. If he goes the other way of breaking his declaration – it will be a breach of contract and therefore a crime.

Third Pillar: *The responsibility lies with the contract and the mind, and the cause-and-effect*

VI. Of what's valuable and what's not, it's connected with our views, and thus, subjective. But respecting another's? Why should we? But

absolute disregard? Why should we either? Materialistically and by fact, usable things are valuable, but a carrot because it can be eaten, isn't more valuable than the oak from the H.M.S Victory to most people. There're probably hundreds of billions and carrots and only a very few planks of the Victory's oak – they may argue, but the carrot is edible, and can sustain better life. Or that you can put the old planks of the H.M.S. Victory in a museum and earn more money than from a carrot, or say something about nationalism. Their logic is based upon how society keeps itself together. What's valuable or not depends, just like the matter of responsibility, either simple usability or the mental process of valuing. And thus, the last three articles have been building up the bricks of this pillar

Fourth Pillar: ***Leash not the Ego; Leash not the objective; but the subjective is for the opinion, instead, stride for the objective solution or conclusion.***

VII.

There's a difference between equality and justice – in fact, equality amongst persons is quite wrong –

for it is for them to be different, to be better or worse. But they must be equal when justice is dealt on them. Justice, instead gives us an indiscriminate thing or law – which is doable and *justified.* Here, it leaves us with the right to be unequal – for wealth to be concentrated on a man because he's earned it – fairly. Of course, a president of a nation may confiscate a lot of wealth without really *earning* them, and his wealth is illegitimate and practically a robbery. Then he deserves to have the wealth confiscated and returned to its owners, and maybe even shot for the sake of revenge. Wealth is distributed on how well you've earned it – no great oppressor have his hands full here; if he has, then you may invite the communists to topple them.

VIII.

But men, in his earning of wealth, is for the better to do so for his happiness. In our pursuit of happiness, or prosperity here, men of older times and the religious says we must follow a guideline – ethics. I declare subjective ethics non-existent, and we should follow none.

If person A hates person B for following the morals of Y Society, and B hates A for being Immoral to Y Society standards, then to him to kill him, to do all harms is right. Any laws that he does accept is wrong to apply to him, like the Laws of Y Society and he is outside its protection, that therefore, the man is neither punishable for his crimes and that any outlaws as him may kill him, and act things upon A that are illegal under Sheep law. Because a person was born UNDER a law doesn't mean he accepts it, and if he accepts with intoxicated and propagated thought, it is neither Legitimate. And, besides, no one in anyone's womb is Legitimate to be under any law that he doesn't accept. But because he doesn't, he should not be killed, declared satanic, or have his basic rights confiscated. Instead, he is simply exempt to things that the law provides, regulates and restricts. But it is for the better that a man should at least partially agree to certain laws. By ‘good’, ‘bad’, or ‘better' – here, I indicate either being beneficial or not, or more beneficial in this context, because, the normal definition of good or bad is subjective matter – and this nihilist version proves very flexible. Even religious moralists can use this one with their own deftinitions.

But of a law, it should not ban an outlaw from bartering with a man inside the law on their terms, (completely confiscating all rights, killing him, etc., the things a normal state would do if it declares someone outlawed etc.) and, as long as he respected the requirements and agreed albeit temporarily and in parts only, he must be granted the services that the institution,(here for ease, it shall be the State)provides. For example, he may agree to pay the bill for education, follow a school's rules but he may not agree to anything else that the A State’s laws provide, restrict and regulate – and here, importantly, the State mustn’t ban outlaws from certain activities and services of the State. But other things does not concern that he may enter a school and abide by its fair rules; say, he agrees to follow some laws in a certain area – if a man kills him in class, then the man shall be arrested; he does so outside of the gate, and the man had only agreed to follow the law inside the school for he's an outlaw then it is legal.

IX.

Anything that says X on paper and Z on ground, then, it is more practical to take Z if our test had been fair enough (nothing is quite ever fair in real life).Or if a modifier changed the result, then we must remove the modifier. Everything is false until proven correct – by which principle we must essentially ignore an unknown and remove it from the equation.

This approves the method of form reflects function. Nationalism, is thus, made for the State, its greatest benefactor so far; Morality for society and reactionaries; and lastly, the free market, to the common man, and Egoism, to rich men and to its practitioner**.** Thus, after another vigorous paragraph, the reader can now see:

Fifth Pillar : the character reflects its use, and thus its function – and thus we judge its usability

X.

Of laws, terms, and conduct, it must be set and flexible only under set conditions. Humanity,kindness and virtue is worth nothing because, an uncountable number of cultures define it in uncountable different ways that are

factually right, and calls out to slit a differing morality's throat sometimes, and as I've said, to those Peoples, their own opinions are right, because it is merely an opinion. But since the only infallible Power is the Destructive, then if a Nation A wins over Nation B, and orders its laws to be opposed so under false and thin reason, when Destructive Power is the reason to those being imposed – without undeniable Reason (Scientific), consent, or Materialistic Necessity that is done out of sincere good-will, then anyone in Nation B can violate it. In fact, I'll declare, that when you live any country on Earth, anywhere else, can violate their law so if the law is imposed upon you a millennia ago (under anyone's consent then), and the State, like till now, makes you follow it without your will. In fact, with this philosophy, all unagreed and unconsented social conduct and Stately law is invalid and you may ‘violate’ it. Then you would be an outlaw, and a Legitimate one, because that law, you refuse to agree. And no man can decide

for another man in the future, his child, someone unrepresented, except with explicit permission and thus given duty! Any decision imposed so is Illegitimate and in violation of Nature's-given rights.
Sixth Pillar: The free man is free from ALL: External, internal, fears.

XI. Thus there stands the reason and justification for the dismantling of all Societies reactionary, and the overthrow of the present States – for a revolution! The chains of hypocritical morality and thieving lords rattle the loudest as we break them! Be free! Be not be strangled – you beggars, geniuses, idiots, men of the money, men of peace, of war, all of you have your chances to be truly free to chase our insane dreams! May we still stand mortal, but the great light of truth is eternally unfaltering. Thus there be forever be in the hands of any man to decide for his own path, not on paper, not on vows, but by the bitter lead and the blood of their foes. I do not declare these followers *right*, but by *truth*, they are ***righteous*** – **righteous** to rise, **righteous** to fight; and **righteous** to enforce! And as bright as the North star may, if to rise, be on the prints of history!

*----------
*

Glossary:

Iron Law of Oligarchy = a political theory, in which the few will always rule the many, no matter the system

Anarchy= the absence or going against authority, or a State

Declaration= a verbal/written statement for one to adhere, often one that carries logical and political power

…Scientifically…=by fact, measurable and undeniable as a solid fact

Legitimate= adhering to a declaration, fact, and practically actual in doing so

Machiavellian= a political ideology by Nicolai Machiavelli in the 15th ce that advocates for a strong, authoritarian state to head a society; often referred to as negatively

Statist= wanting or wishing to improve the power of the State; or State-like entities

Free contract= an agreement between two persons to do something; that is, voluntary both on paper and on ground; buying or selling is one, but a poor man being forced into slavery by contract is not

Reactionary= anti-reform, the reverse of progress and freedom

The State= The government but with its both external and internal nature; that, with its subjects, territory and culture may form a Nation

Monopoly= having a right or power that only one is allowed to do something, and no one else

Egalitarian= taking or having many forms and things that may vary

Hierarchy= certain inequalities that may be forced, that causes a top-down structure of Feudalism

Libertarians= an anti-statist ideology that believes in the most minimal interference of the unproductive State in the productive economy (based on economic productivity above all), and therefore, that all social problems in absence of interference should find a solution to themselves

Warlord= one who rules by the sword and not by anything else to make himself legitimate

Socialism= a broad spectrum of leftist ideologies that advocate for equality, and the greater good of the whole of society, whilst they forget that humans have a rather very strong free will and the State isn’t a perfect little angel. This definition does not include anarchist socialism.

Communism= a far more radical form of socialism that wishes for a stateless society under the leadership of the working class with no property or a free market; money is force and a source of exploitation and many bad things to their eyes; they also forget about human nature and have mostly failed miserably

Fascism= a most loathed ideology that uses the State to mobilize the resources of a nation by authoritarian means, with no regards for personal affairs

Extortion= robbery, but more fitting to one done by a State, who makes you pay for lied and broken contracts, and done so by force that is less visible

Outlaw= outside the law; not under or protected by the law

The Conversations

Of Nelsoncism

This is a guide answering questions, not an actual debate, thus its low quality. Read this for clarification, rather than to extend your readership of the ideas of Nelsonicism.

Conversation: *on Ethical Discourse*

S: …What were you saying?

N:… The rejection of natural authority, that is and are, by tradition. Like the authority of a parent over a child.

A: I don’t like your idea.

N: Say, if your mother wills you wash your clothes, and orders you to do so. And you don't want to. It is coercion and an illegitimate act. Because it is HER will to wash them, not yours, and as long as one will bear her dirty clothes, then she can righteously refuse to do so. But he cannot expect her mother to clean his dirty clothes when it is not hers, and expecting so would be frankly like waiting for a theft to happen for your wallet.

A: Absolutely not! If she orders it, you have a biological and a moral duty to comply, when she’d given birth to you, feed you, heal you and there’s something called filial pity to be complied and respected.

N: Did you ask to be born to be contracted to comply her orders and interests?

A: What an absurd question, one must be grateful of his life!

N: And we do not ask for life, nor there is any unbendable fact to reinforce it. Besides, why should such a case break the laws of free contract like for any other affair, when such a fact is universally and therefore universally applied so?

S: I agree with him, sort of.

A: Just for the sake of not washing one's clothes! That is not how a person with brains reason.

N: It is HOW a person with brains reason. A simple disobedience, when given cause and reason, becomes a revolution!

S: How intriguing…

A: Seriously, our discussion is not about being forced into chores, it is about ethics. And this man has stated the non-existence of morality

N: Being forced to do so, to do such chores, is a coercion and against the laws of free contract, and thus, a crime and an illegitimate action.

A: But then, laws are based on ethical ideas such as justice and honesty. Child labour laws exist because of ethics.

N: No, justice nor honesty are ethical ideas. The Nelsonicist ideal of justice is based upon logic and factuality. A breach of contract is a crime because by fact and logic, it has agreed a consented declaration to obey it.

A: But child labour laws exist because society thinks it’s wrong for children to work in harsh conditions. NOT REASON, IT’S ETHICS THAT PROPELS THIS MOVEMENT.

N: It is wrong to use child labour if the child is not willing – this stands as a coercion, not a free contract between a provider and a purchaser. But a willing hand? Absolutely right to let them. A man must decide for himself.

A: How heartless, how inhumane! This whole affair is profit-oriented.

N: Of course, it's profit oriented, when it's egoist and nihilist. If you don't want so, you can live under Kim Jung Un's communist North Korea or the fascist Nazi Germany for all the good it does.

A: But ethics aren't insignificant, as you say. It runs the mechanics of society, creates laws, and defines civilizations. A complete rejection is utterly impossible.

N: Mon cher, with the greatest honesty, ethics are insignificant by reason, but significant because fools took it for real – and become minions, enslaved by hiarchism, Oligarchy and the State.

A: Just calling someone who does not agree with you fools, is wild. You can have opinions, but not to that degree.

N: I call them fools, because they're holding a subjective to be objective, because they cannot think around it. Because they hold all of their mental capacity within' such meagre bounds.

A: Now I give up. I utterly give up.

N: And oh, who'd like you and gets the most benefit for you to not to keep reasoning, to be unable to question, to think over barriers?

Not your parents.

Not your national identity.

Not even society.

It’s authoritarianism and the sort of fools that runs Iran's Islamic Republic.

A: Now, this makes me feel retarded.

N: No, you aren’t! Your arms of intellect are strong, yet unstreched, they remain, yet unexposed to use, to freedom, to processing, yet only used to a minimum!

A: But I’ll still not be convinced by your arguments.

N: And I will defend as to what’s in my power, your right to say so.

A: Why do you despise America?

N: The whole nation is like sheep with tusks. Though they can reform, though a revolution, they can launch, cheated, lied, and deluded by its own democracy and rulers, to become essentially a wealth-based oligarchy with little and less merit. Stripped of sense and reason, reduced to a herd of bleating goats!

S: Describe minarchy at its best.

N: When one walks out of a warm, heated house into his garden under a full moon he will feel cold, but liberated. Such is anarchism. The restrictive interior is the State’s authoritarianism. Liberated, yes, but cold; but if we construct a tower over the house that is, spacious, open aired, and comfortably furnished, that is Minarchism.

A: I’ve another against you. Something that cannot be measured by science doesn’t mean that it’s nothing. Ethics are people doing what’s right, not mere factual correction.

N: There is no right or wrong! That’s why they’re non-existent in the first place. And because of not being a fact makes them deniable and makes it variable, and thus arises many deadly conflicts. Besides, it is an important tool for modern feudalism created by politics and the rich, and the State to keep people in line.

A: But science does not tell us whether It should, only HOW. And taking science to a wrong interpretation is such a foolish thing to do.

N: First of all, my counter, is that, science equals to facts, and many facts tell us which is factually wrong or right, and thereby that ethics are no more than mere opinions. And that many of them contradict facts anyway, and restrict one’s ability to effectively conceive many things.

Indeed it is a very vile thing that mere opinions opposite to universal facts, hammers our minds into a shape to be, bluntly enslaved by greater ones.

A: Then if there’s no ethics, how shall any sort of trust function? That’s the purpose of ethics.

N: Oh, we can function upon the simple undeniable laws of free contract. If a friend betrays me in an agreement, for him it is right, but not to a third person view– a breach of contract is illegal. Besides, when there’re possibly millions of ethical systems in place that matches factual standards, there simply stands no standard.

A: See! Your opinion, your philosophy Is all too biased. There’re so many of them, and yours is just one!

N: And I am resolving all of such diverse contradiction is to simply laugh at all of them, that they’re mere opinions! The Nelsonicist ethical system is based upon terms of free contract, which

are facts, not the word of some unknown hermit a millennia ago.

And, since these are mere opinions. Take none to follow. Follow ourselves. Follow our own egos, so that we may be guided to our own cause and be not fooled to take one else's.

A: Fair, here stands my last resort. How will you argue what's bad when you have no standard of what's good, which requires some ethics. And you're using the non-existent ethics to argue against them.

N: Ohh, since this thought must adhere by undeniable things. Which I define as:

Good= beneficial

Bad= unbeneficial or harmful

Here, we can built even more statements from than the stricter definitions of the reactionaries.

And one cannot argue that it’s merely an opinion to its practitioner.

A: Then how do we know what anyway for this to be undeniable? We scarcely know everything.

N: We don’t know everything. But we know the difference between fact and opinion from the thousands of years of human progress. We know laws of science, weakness of democracy, how much a tree grows, and so on. But making what we do not know for certain as what we know results in myth and religion, and an enormous waste of resources on it. I do not denounce the catholic church right now – which is quite useful without much consumption, but I do denounce the Islamic Republic of Iran, and the Burmese Sasanaa wasting the time of thousands upon thousands of children by force-teaching them theology!

.